PHYSICAL REVIEW

LETTERS

VOLUME 52

30 APRIL 1984

NUMBER 18

Fractal Geometry and Brownian Motion: A New Parameter to Describe Molecular Motion

J. G. Powles The Physics Laboratories, The University, Canterbury, England

and

N. Quirke

School of Chemical Engineering, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York 14853 (Received 9 December 1983)

The lengths of molecular trajectories in an argonlike liquid simulated by molecular dynamics have been found to be fractal over a substantial range of scales with a Richardson coefficient of $\alpha = 0.65$ (Mandelbrot dimensionality of d = 1.65). The results obey a simple empirical relation with three parameters. We believe α to be a useful new parameter to describe the form of trajectories of molecules in fluids where none has previously been available, and that it is a state function.

PACS numbers: 05.40.+j, 61.25.Bi

The idea of fractional dimensionality goes back at least to Hausdorff.¹ It was in effect applied to the analysis of coastlines, etc., in a seminal paper by Richardson² and has recently been popularized by Mandelbrot's provocative book.³ It is currently an attractive idea because it is a scaling phenomenon which may relate to Widom's scaling hypothesis⁴ and Wilson's renormalization group⁵ which are finding wide application in theoretical physics. This has made respectable the use of nonintegral dimensionality⁶ in physical science.

Mandelbrot³ discusses the application of fractal geometry to Brownian motion and even devotes a whole chapter to this topic. However, the connection between his analysis of mathematical models and the Brownian motion of molecules in real or at least realistic liquids is not very clear.

It is not yet possible in an actual experiment to follow the trajectory of a molecule in a real liquid in detail. We therefore utilize a computer simulation of a "typical" liquid in circumstances in which it is known that this is a realistic model of an actual liquid such as liquid argon. We give only a few parameters of the simulation since it is quite conventional.

The intermolecular potential chosen was a central pair-wise Lennard-Jones 12-6 interaction potential cut off at a distance $r = 2.5\sigma$, where σ is the length parameter in the potential and is effectively the diameter of the molecule. We used 108 molecules with cyclic boundary conditions, a reduced density, $\rho\sigma^3 = 0.65$ (ρ is the number density), and a reduced temperature, kT/e = 0.93 (*e* is the energy parameter in the Lennard-Jones potential; we reserve the usual symbol, ϵ , for the scale, see below). This is a typical liquid state about halfway between the triple point and the critical point and moreover is on the coexistence line so that the pressure applied to the liquid is the vapor pressure.⁷

The time step was 0.1 Verlet units⁸ which corresponds, for the parameters for liquid argon, to about 10^{-14} s. In the simulation we ran for 600

© 1984 The American Physical Society

steps for equilibration and then for 5000 steps, the latter being much longer than the characteristic time for changes in the particle velocity, about 10^{-13} s in this case. We recorded the trajectory of a particular atom and analyzed it for possible fractal properties.

It will be recalled that a fractal curve has the property that if one measures its length, $L(\epsilon)$, using a scale, i.e., a step distance, ϵ , then

 $L(\epsilon) \propto \epsilon^{-\alpha}$,

where α is a constant, at least for a set of particular values of ϵ .

We employ here Richardson's empirical notation since it is α which is actually measured. Mandelbrot advocates that α should be regarded as $d - d_T$ where d is a fractal dimension and d_T is the topological dimension. $d_T = 1$ for our trajectories so that $d = 1 + \alpha$ here.

An example of a fractal curve is the Koch curve, K_{∞} , illustrated in Fig. 1, which we shall use later. For K_{∞} ,

 $\alpha = (\ln 4/\ln 3) - 1 = 0.2618...,$

provided $\epsilon = 1/3^m$, where 1 is the end-to-end length and *m* is an integer. K_{∞} is a continuous nondifferentiable curve of infinite length, as is the quantum path of a particle.⁹ In this paper, however, we consider only classical mechanics.

We proceed to analyze the molecular trajectory, after of course compensating for the discontinuities which arise from the use of cyclic boundary conditions. This "stretching" procedure is familiar to us in the determination of the self-diffusion coefficient, D, from a simulation. Since the trajectory is presumably continuous we regard ϵ as a continuous variable as is $L(\epsilon)$. However, we present the



FIG. 1. The fractal Koch curves for which $L(\epsilon/3) - (4/3)L(\epsilon)$ for $\epsilon/1 = 1/3^m$. $\alpha = (\ln 4/\ln 3) - l$, i.e., d = 1.2618...

results in the manner of experimental results, in equal increments of $-\log_2(\epsilon/\sigma)$, which is convenient and appropriate. We have a program which measures $L(\epsilon/\sigma)$ for any value of ϵ by stepping along the trajectory as if with a pair of dividers. We take the trajectory between simulation time steps as straight lines but our time step is so short that this is entirely justified (see Fig. 2). We include end corrections which are fractions of ϵ as recommended by Richardson.²

The result is shown in Fig. 2. For a large range of ϵ , about 2⁴, we get a quite good straight line with a slope corresponding to $\alpha = 0.65$. For large values of ϵ (note that ϵ decreases to the right in the figures) we get the end-to-end distance, L_e , which on the average will be near the root mean square distance



FIG. 2. Fractal analysis of the trajectory of a molecule in a typical liquid, from a computer simulation, circles. $L(\epsilon/\sigma)$ is the length measured by stepping along the trajectory with "dividers" set at ϵ/σ . Note: ϵ/σ diminishes from left to right by a factor 2 for each unit. L_e is the observed end-to-end distance whose root mean square average over many trajectories would be L_r . The mean contour length, $\langle L_c \rangle$, depends only on the temperature. Also indicated is the mean value of ϵ for one step of the simulation, ϵ_s , and also the mean distance travelled for loss of correlation of the particle velocity, ϵ_v . For a gas the latter would be the mean free path. The best straight line through the quasilinear part of the plot yields a value of Richardson's parameter of $\alpha = 0.65$. Also given is the corresponding plot of the first half of the same trajectory.

between the two ends of the trajectory, L_r , which, for these relatively long trajectories, is simply

$$L_r = (6DN\Delta t)^{1/2}$$

We have measured the diffusion constant, D, although in fact Verlet's empirical formula⁸ is quite adequate. For various particles and different trajectories (see below) there is of course a considerable statistical fluctuation of L_e about L_r .

For ϵ small enough $L(\epsilon)$ approaches the contour length, L_c . This is immediately estimated from

$$\langle L_c \rangle = \langle v \rangle N \Delta t,$$

where $\langle v \rangle$ is the mean molecular speed which is determined by the temperature and the mass of the molecule. In reduced units it is independent of the mass of the molecule. Of course the actual contour length for any particular trajectory, L_c , fluctuates about the mean value but the fluctuations are relatively much smaller than for L_c .

Clearly the trajectory is not fractal for small enough ϵ . It becomes effectively smooth, however, well before ϵ is the mean step length of the simulation, ϵ_s ; see Fig. 2. We have verified that the trajectory really is smooth because the plot in Fig. 2 is not affected if we use a computational step length one half as long or if we use only alternate points of the original trajectory.

We can guess that the scale at which the trajecto-

ry starts to be appreciably smooth is given by

$$\epsilon_{v} \simeq \langle v \rangle \tau_{v}$$

where τ_{v} is the correlation time of the molecular velocity. τ_{v} is immediately obtained from *D* since $\tau_{v} = (m/kT)D$. This scale is marked in Fig. 2 and is, as expected, at the knee of the curve. For a gas ϵ_{v} is virtually the mean free path.

We find that the curve in Fig. 2 is given with remarkable accuracy by the empirical relation

$$L(\epsilon) - L_c(\epsilon^2/\epsilon_u^2 + 1)^{-\alpha/2}$$

We have also analyzed shorter trajectories for the same thermodynamic state, in fact parts of the trajectory used for Fig. 2. For the trajectories for steps 1–2500 (see Fig. 2), 2501–5000, 1–1250, 1251–2500, etc., the plots are indistinguishable from that in Fig. 2, after a vertical shift to compensate for the change in L_c . For the trajectories 1–625, etc., the plots are quite noisy and begin to diverge from Fig. 2. In any case such plots are clearly too short. The "gap" between L_c and L_r falls as $N^{1/2}$.

It appears therefore that the fractal coefficient, α , and the form of the curve given above are independent of the trajectory length as long as one can reasonably make a plot such as Fig. 2. Only two parameters are required given the form above and the temperature: the self-diffusion constant which is trivial, and the fractal coefficient, α . Thus α is a



FIG. 3. A randomized Koch curve of order 6 analyzed as if it were a molecular trajectory. The apparent value of α is 0.25 whereas for K_{∞} it is 0.26... provided $\epsilon/1$ = $1/3^m$. Compare with Fig. 2, but note the change of scale of abcissae.



FIG. 4. Analysis of a randomized Peano curve of order 12 with $\theta = 99.1135^{\circ}$ for which $\alpha = 0.65$. This curve, after translation of the axes, can be superimposed on the curve of Fig. 2.

new parameter for describing molecular motion in a liquid.

Mandelbrot³ states (p. 15) that for Brownian motion, d=2, i.e., $\alpha = 1$, which is clearly not the case here. For reasons obsucre to us he uses the model of the Peano curve (see below) with θ having the critical value 90°. However, our results suggest that molecular trajectories undergoing Brownian motion are fractal to finite order, in the sense that at small enough scale they become smooth curves, as surely must be the case if we believe in Newton's law of motion.

In view of Mandelbrot's strong feelings about nomenclature we suggest with trepidation that our curves be called "finite fractals." In illustration of this point of view we have analyzed a Koch curve for n = 6, i.e., 4096 steps, as if it were a molecular trajectory using our computer program just as we did for Fig. 2. The result is shown in Fig. 3. This bears a striking resemblance to Fig. 2. The best-fit line to the straight part gives $\alpha = 0.25$ which is within "experimental error" of the value, 0.262, which is for $\epsilon/1 = 1/3^m$. The exact result for any ϵ is extremely complex so our result has "Laplacian" randomness. We have also randomized a K_6 curve by placing the triangles to the left or right at random at each stage of development, K_1 , K_2, \ldots, K_6 . The "experimental result" is then even more similar to that in Fig. 2. Indeed the curve itself is very similar to the real trajectory.

Finally, we have used as a finite fractal curve a randomized Peano curve of order 12 with θ = 99.1135° (Fig. 4), which gives α = 0.65. The

shape of the analyzed curve is indistinguishable from that in Fig. 2 after suitable bodily translation which is permissible because of the arbitrariness of the scales. On the other hand the curve bears little apparent resemblance to the actual trajectory.

We have also looked at the trajectories of molecules in gases and crystals but we defer discussion of these to another place.

One of us (J.G.P.) thanks the University of Kent (UKC) for a study leave. The computations were carried out on the Physics Laboratory VAX 750 which was purchased from the UKC UGC equipment grant and was activated by Dr. M. R. Halse and Mr. B. Webber. Acknowledgment is made to the donors of the Petroleum Research Fund administered by the American Chemical Society for partial support of this research.

¹F. Hausdorff, Math. Ann. **79**, 157 (1919).

²C. F. Richardson, General Systems Yearbook **6**, 139 (1961).

³B. B. Mandelbrot, *The Fractal Geometry of Nature* (Freeman, San Francisco, 1982).

⁴B. Widom, J. Chem. Phys. **43**, 3829, 3989 (1965).

⁵K. G. Wilson, Phys. Rev. B 4, 3174, 3184 (1971).

⁶K. G. Wilson and M. E. Fisher, Phys. Rev. Lett. **28**, 240 (1972).

⁷J. G. Powles, Physica (to be published).

⁸L. Verlet, Phys. Rev. 159, 98 (1967).

- ⁹R. P. Feynmann and A. R. Hibbs, *Quantum Mechanics*
- and Path Integrals (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1965).